

JUL 19 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-91 were examined. Claims 1, 14, 24-25, 53 and 55 have been amended. No claims are cancelled or are newly presented. New subject matter has not been introduced.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The examiner has rejected claims 1-22, 31-53 and 62-83 under §103(a) as obvious over Fleischer III et al. (US 5,799,073) in view of Driskell et al. (US 6,072,493) and Kam et al. (US 6,968,320).

Claims 23-30, 54-61 and 84-91 stand rejected under §103(a) as obvious over Fleischer III et al. (US 5,799,073) in view of Driskell et al. (US 6,072,493) and Kam et al. (US 6,968,320) and further in view of Nolting et al. (US 6,721,405).

In one embodiment of the present invention, as set forth in claim 1, a method is provided for analyzing telecommunications data relating to a business entity, using business entity aggregation criteria. Telecommunication provider invoices are obtained from a plurality of telecommunications providers that include telecommunications data relating to the business entity. The telecommunications data that is obtained from a plurality of the telecommunication provider's invoices according to business entity aggregation criteria is used to create an aggregated bill for the business entity. The entire aggregated bill, or any portion of it, is separated into service categories. Information including locations or sites of a customer's telecommunication services, services provided by site, a list of providers of each service, and accounts used for billing each service is stored in a database. A translation table is provided that translates each telecommunications provider's codes for its specific telecommunications data to a standard code, which is then implemented for use in the database. A computer program is implemented to check for errors in the telecommunication provider invoices and discrepancies between the billing data and the translation table data. A service feature is supplied to produce forecasts for the user from the telecommunication provider's invoices and combinations of consolidated

telecommunication data. Finally, a customer data querying application, is provided that is capable of performing the search, selecting the desired data, or other processing of the data.

Fleischer does provide a method for collecting telecommunications providers information pertaining to bills, call demographics, etc. However, Fleischer implies that the customer is a single user and not an entire business entity. The fact that the system of the present invention analyzes aggregated billing data from a number of different telecommunications providers is the largest distinction between Fleischer et al. and the present invention. Furthermore, Fleischer et al. does not reference multiple telecommunications providers. The present invention has the ability to pull this telecommunications usage data from a number of different communications providers. Furthermore, Fleischer et al. does not provide a method of organizing this data from multiple providers. The present invention uses a lookup table to combine all of the information stored using different codes based upon the respective provider, and combines it all into information stored in a database using one uniform encoding scheme. The lookup table is a necessity because providers each have their own format in which they store consumer data. By consolidating the data from multiple providers into one format, through the use of a lookup table, the consumer can be provided with combined information.

The present invention provides a system that enables the customer to continually access a database that contains all of the data called an Information Service Mainframe. This database is unlike Fleischer et al. in that it is specifically the customer's database. This database can be located on site with the customer, because the database is stored on a server that is owned by the customer. While the providers can access the database, the database is part of a system that the customer can access using a data query interface. This data querying interface allows the customer to organize the data in any desired combination. The difference between the present invention and Fleischer et al. is that the raw data from the telecommunications providers is in the processing information storage method. Fleischer et al. utilizes an Information Service Mainframe

that is owned and operated by the telecommunication provider. In the present invention, since information from multiple telecommunication providers is analyzed, an independent data management system has to be used. In the present invention, this is known as a Telecommunication Management Service. This is a separate entity from the telecommunication provider, and is where the translation of each telecommunication provider's data format to a common format occurs.

In conclusion, Fleischer et al. differs from the present invention in a number of ways. First, Fleischer et al. does not provide a system capable of handling multiple telecommunications providers aggregated billing data. Second, Fleischer et al. does not detail a system where the telecommunication providers transfer the aggregated billing data over to a service that creates a uniform encoding data encoding of all received data types.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for examination, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-1641 (Docket No. 07464-0005).

Respectfully submitted,

HELLER EHRMAN LLP

Date: 7.19.06


Paul Davis, Reg. No. 29,294

275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 324-7000
Customer No. 25213